



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/660,484

09/12/2003

Hidekazu Ozawa

117103

6333

25944 7590 06/25/2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. BOX 320850

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

LETT, THOMAS J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/660,484	Applicant(s) OZAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner THOMAS J. LETT	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/4/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08 April 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 08 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Applicants submit that Webb does not disclose that the device is a server, which controls the image processing apparatus or which provides an instruction that is acquired from the server.
4. Examiner disagrees with the amended feature not being disclosed because Webb discloses that the printer is also a server, see at least col. 1, lines 9-10 and col. 1, lines 16-22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2625

5. Claims 1-4, 5-14, 16, 17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Webb et al (US 5,727,135).

Regarding claim 1, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus (host computer 11 of figure 1) comprising:

an acquisition component that communicates over a network (LAN 21) with a device that is a server, (printer 16 of figure 1. The printer is also a server, see at least col. 1, lines 9-10 and col. 1, lines 16-22) which controls the image processing apparatus so that a series of processes (printing functions of a control panel) are applied to document data, the acquiring component acquiring an instruction from the device, the instruction instructing the image processing apparatus to perform a first process included in the series of processes (host computer 11 is instructed to emulate a device display of various processing functions displayed on a monitor 13) and including setting information representing a setting of the first process (settings are also displayed on monitor 13);

a display component (display 13) that displays screen information, including an operation screen (MarkVision Printer Utility software) for setting a piece of setting information described in the instruction (setting of a pushbutton function on a console menu, col. 10, lines 48-55);

a designation component (MarkVision Printer Utility has a "MORE" component that will display settings that are restricted from view, col. 10, Table 1) that, when the setting information included in the instruction has an attribute representing that changing of the setting information is restricted, designates a display pattern of the setting information having the attribute as a display pattern that is different from a display pattern of changeable setting information (display pattern will be changed when "MORE" is selected); and

a display information control component (MarkVision Printer Utility software) that controls the display component to display the screen information in accordance with the display pattern that is different from the display pattern of changeable setting information.

Regarding claim 2, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus of claim 1, wherein the designation component designates a display pattern in which the setting information is not displayed (MarkVision Printer Utility has a "MORE" component that will designate settings that are restricted from view, col. 10, Table 1).

Regarding claim 3, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus of claim 1, wherein the designation component designates as the display pattern a pattern in which image information representing that the setting information is unchangeable is added (MarkVision Printer Utility has a "Setup Menu" component that will specify printer control, i.e., add settings, col. 10, Table 1).

Regarding claim 4, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus of claim 1, wherein the designation component designates as the display pattern a pattern in which the setting information is fixed (MarkVision Printer Utility software of figure 1 with default values).

Regarding claim 6, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus (host computer 11 of figure 1) comprising:

an acquisition component that communicates over a network (LAN 21) with a device that is a server, (printer 16 of figure 1. The printer is also a server, see at least col. 1, lines 9-10 and col. 1, lines 16-22) which controls the image processing apparatus so that a series of processes (printing functions of a control panel) are applied to document data, the acquiring component acquiring an instruction from the device, the instruction instructing the image processing apparatus to perform a first process included in the series of processes (host computer 11 is instructed to emulate a device display of various processing functions displayed on a monitor

Art Unit: 2625

13) and including setting information representing a setting of the first process (settings are also displayed on monitor 13);

a display component (MarkVision Printer Utility software) that displays screen information, including an operation screen for setting a piece of setting information described in the instruction (setting of a pushbutton function on a console menu, col. 10, lines 48-55);

an input component for inputting the setting information (any pushbutton of Table 1); and

an evaluation component (MarkVision Printer Utility software shows any controls of a printer device) for evaluating, when setting information included in the instruction has an attribute representing that the setting information is changeable, the setting information input by the input component on the basis of the attribute (the emulation of the printer control panel will reflect/mimic whether a setting is changeable.).

Regarding claim 7, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus of claim 6, wherein the evaluation component evaluates, when an inputtable range of the setting information is expressed as the attribute, whether an input value of the setting information obtained by the input component falls within the inputtable range (the emulation of the printer control panel will reflect/mimic whether a setting falls within an inputtable range.).

Regarding claim 8, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus of claim 6, wherein the evaluation component evaluates, when input essentiality of the setting information is expressed as the attribute, whether inputting of the setting information is performed by the input component (MarkVision Printer Utility software is an emulator program that determines the input button source.).

Regarding claim 9, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus of claim 6, wherein the evaluation component evaluates, when an input character type of the setting

Art Unit: 2625

information is expressed as the attribute, whether an input value of the setting information obtained by the input component is the input character type (font settings, col. 10, Table 1).

Regarding claim 10, Webb et al disclose an input processing apparatus of claim 6, wherein the display component further displays an evaluation result obtained by the evaluation component (font settings, col. 10, Table 1).

Regarding claim 11, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus of claim 6, further comprising a change component for changing input setting information to predetermined setting information when an evaluation result obtained by the evaluation component is evaluated to be incorrect (resetting values to user default values, col. 10, table 1).

Regarding claim 12, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus of claim 6, further comprising a setting information storage component for storing setting information input by the input component, wherein, when the next screen is displayed (a "MORE" pushbutton allows for a next screen of additional settings, and a selection of a different printer allows for display of the next printer's settings), the setting information stored in the setting information storage component is used.

Regarding claim 13, Webb et al disclose an image processing method which can acquire, by communication over a network, an instruction from a device that is a server, (printer 16 of figure 1. The printer is also a server, see at least col. 1, lines 9-10 and col. 1, lines 16-22) which controls the image processing apparatus so that a series of processes (printing functions of a control panel) are applied to document data, the acquiring component acquiring an instruction from the device, the instruction instructing the image processing apparatus to perform a first process included in the series of processes and including setting information representing a setting of the first process, the image processing method comprising the steps of:

displaying a screen on the basis of screen information, including an operation screen for setting a piece of setting information described in the instruction (any pushbutton of Table 1) from the server;

designating, when the setting information included in the instruction from the server has an attribute representing that changing of the setting information is restricted, as a display pattern of the setting information having the attribute a display pattern that is different from a display pattern of changeable setting information (MarkVision Printer Utility has a “MORE” component that will designate settings that are restricted from view, col. 10, Table 1); and

outputting screen information for displaying the setting information in accordance with the display pattern (MarkVision Printer Utility software shows any controls of a printer device).

Claim 14, a method claim, is rejected for the same reason as claim 6.

Regarding claim 16, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising a transmission component that transmits over the network to the device a result of the first process being processed according to the setting information set by a user operating the operation screen (printer “detailed status” using the MarkVision Utility.).

Regarding claim 17, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the setting information includes a setting item and a setting value corresponding to the setting item to be set by the user (a printer’s “detailed status” using the MarkVision Utility.).

Regarding claim 19, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the series of processes is to be processed by a plurality of processing devices, each of the processing devices corresponding to each of the processes and communicating over the network (emulation of a plurality of printers shown in figure 8; e.g., “Boris Porky P”).

Regarding claim 20, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the series of processes includes a second process to be processed by a processing device different from the image processing apparatus, and the processing device applies the second process to the document data after the image processing apparatus applies the first process to the document data under the control of the server (Webb et al disclose a host computer 1 that can display settings and instruction information of several image processing devices as shown in figure 8 such as "Boris Porky_P, Boris Augusta", etc.

Regarding claim 21, Webb et al disclose an image processing apparatus according to claim 20, wherein the first and second processes are different types of processes, and each of the first and second processes includes at least one of a copying process, a printing process, a scanning process, a facsimile transmitting/receiving process, an e-mail deliver operation process, a storing in a repository process, a reading from the repository operation, an OCR (Optical Character Recognition) process of an image, and a noise reduction process of an image (Webb et al disclose a host computer 1 that can include a printing process for attached printers displayed on monitor 13 of figure 8.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb et al (US 5,727,135) in view of Nakagiri et al (US 6,924,826 B1).

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding claim 5, Webb et al do not disclose an image processing apparatus of claim 1, wherein, when a usage authorization is set in the setting information included in the instruction, the designation component designates the display pattern on the basis of the usage authorization.

Nakagiri et al teach usage authorization parameters in figure 23.

Webb et al and Nakagiri et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Nakagiri et al to Webb et al in order to obtain designation of a display pattern on the basis of the usage authorization. The motivation for doing so would be to authorize use of settings.

7. Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb et al (US 5,727,135) in view of Mochizuki (US 6,804,018 B1).

Regarding claim 15, Webb et al do not disclose that a first process includes at least one of a noise reduction process of an image included in the document data, an image rotation process of the image, an Optical Character Recognition (OCR) process of the image, and an image binding process of the image.

Mochizuki teaches a printer with an OCR capability, col. 6, lines 39-48 and thus the OCR settings would be emulated on the display of Webb et al.

Webb et al and Mochizuki are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Mochizuki to Webb et al in order to obtain emulation that incorporates OCR functions of a network printer. The motivation for doing so would be to read document text.

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding claim 18, Webb et al do not disclose that a series of processes comprises at least two of a copying process, a printing process, a scanning process, a facsimile transmitting process, a facsimile receiving process, an e-mail deliver operation process, a storing in a repository process, a reading from the repository operation, an OCR (Optical Character Recognition) process of an image, and a noise reduction process of an image.

Mochizuki teaches a printer with an OCR capability, col. 6, lines 39-48 and thus the OCR settings would be emulated on the display of Webb et al as well as printing.

Webb et al and Mochizuki are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Mochizuki to Webb et al in order to obtain emulation that incorporates OCR and printer functions of a network printer. The motivation for doing so would be to read document text and document printing.

8. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb et al (US 5,727,135) in view of Beard et al (US 6,615,297 B1).

Regarding claim 22, Webb et al do not disclose wherein the instruction is constituted by an XML format file and the attribute representing that changing of the setting information is restricted is specified in the XML format file.

Beard et al teach of an architecture similar to that of Webb et al and further teaches the use of an XML protocol as a replacement/alternative to using the NPA protocol used for changing settings, see col. 5, lines 14-21.

Webb et al and Beard et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the XML interface feature of Beard et al to Webb et al in

Art Unit: 2625

order to obtain emulation that communicates via XML. The motivation for doing so would be to use an alternative protocol in the interface system.

Regarding claim 23, Webb et al do not disclose an image processing apparatus further comprising a judging component that judges whether or not the attribute representing that changing of the setting information is restricted is specified in the XML format file.

Beard et al teach of an architecture similar to that of Webb et al and further teaches the use of a table used to validate/judge requests of a format file shown in col. 5, lines 45-66 where there are both public and private (restricted) setting information. As with claim 22, an XML format can be used for the file.

Webb et al and Beard et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the validation feature of Beard et al to Webb et al in order to obtain emulation that communicates via XML. The motivation for doing so would be to validate restricted data.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS J. LETT whose telephone number is (571)272-7464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thomas J. Lett/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625